

**To:** Enos, Cassandra@DWR[Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov]  
**Cc:** Vendlinski, Tim[vendlinski.tim@epa.gov]; Skophammer, Stephanie[skophammer.stephanie@epa.gov]  
**From:** Foresman, Erin  
**Sent:** Thur 11/6/2014 6:54:14 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Topics for Nov 10th mtg

Hi Cassandra,

Thanks for sending this to me. I cc'd Stephanie Skophammer so she can provide input if she has anything to suggest.

I think these topics are good for discussion. We should acknowledge that a few of the bullets could be v. long discussions and we may not get all the way through the listed bullets. We have seven bullets and 120 minutes so that is a little over 15 minutes per bullet without introductions and closing items.

My expectation is that for each of these topics we can:

- Confirm we all understand the comment & the perspectives of DWR/ICF, lead feds and EPA to the extent that they are similar, different, or the same.
- Identify if the comment/issue will be addressed and resolved in the supplemental or final or not at all (if we agree to disagree).
- If the comment will be addressed, we should identify and agree on how it will be addressed.
- Identify a follow-up period for comments that will be addressed so we ensure that we move forward without surprises.

Stephanie and/or Tim do you have anything to add?

Cassandra, will there be anyone taking notes and recording action items and decisions?

Thanks!

Erin

Erin Foresman

US EPA | SF Bay Delta | Environmental Scientist

C/O NMFS 650 Capitol Mall| Sacramento, CA 95814

916-930-3722|[www.epa.gov/sfbaydelta](http://www.epa.gov/sfbaydelta)

*Schedule: M 7:30a - 4:00p; T - F 7:30a - 2:00p*

**From:** Enos, Cassandra@DWR [mailto:Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov]

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 05, 2014 11:40 AM

**To:** Foresman, Erin

**Cc:** Vendlinski, Tim

**Subject:** FW: Topics for Nov 10th mtg

Erin – Below is the list of discussion items for the meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup>. This includes the EPA revisions to the list we sent. I am planning on using this list to develop the agenda. I just wondered if you wanted to make any further edits? Also, it looks like we will be holding the meeting at ICF's offices. I'll include that in the agenda, but just wanted to give you a heads up.

Thanks, C.

Topics for Discussion:

- EPA concerned that DEIS does not fully define and describe the relevance of the estuarine salinity gradient or report a year-round salinity gradient/Delta outflow analysis for each alternative.
- EPA concerned that DEIS does not describe potential effects on DO and other contaminant concentrations as a result of more frequent dead pool conditions in upstream reservoirs
- EPA concerns over sole reliance on habitat restoration for ecosystem recovery, recognizing that existing freshwater diversions and significantly diminished seaward flows have played a significant role in precluding the recovery of Bay Delta ecosystem processes and declining fish populations.

- EPA concerned that CMI alternatives may contribute to declining populations of delta smelt, longfin smelt, green sturgeon, and winter-run, spring-run, fall-run, and late fall-run salmon and may not be mitigated by restoration. Restoration success assumed to be 100% in the DEIR/EIS. Less than 100% success may influence salinity results.
- EPA concerned that there is a potential for conflict with other HCPs.
- EPA concern that modeled longfin smelt abundance is estimated to decline for all but one of the alternatives, juvenile delta smelt entrainment is predicted to increase under Alt 4, and believes that delta smelt rearing habitat should be expressed in absolute terms. EPA requests more detail regarding how north Delta diversion screens would prevent entrainment.
- How will NEPA effects determinations be revised in light of this discussion for beneficial use impairments?

Cassandra Enos-Nobriga

Environmental Management

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan

Department of Water Resources

901 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Office: (916) 651-0178

Mobile: (916) 835-6981